OIPE JC71
OCT 08 2004
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re: Application of R. Brochu et al.

Date: October 6, 2004

Serial No. 10/677,938

Examiner: Tara L. Mayo

Filed: 10/01/2003

Art Group: 3671

For: Corrugated Leaching Chamber

Atty Docket No. 2229

RESPONSE AND AMENDMENT

To: Commissioner for Patents

Please amend the specification as shown in the attachments.

Please amend the claims as shown in the status of claims.

Please replace the drawings with the 8 sheets of formal drawings which are enclosed.

REMARKS

This is in response to the office action of July 6, 2004.

Applicants provide replacement drawings. Fig. 15 has been altered as shown in red on the marked up copy, enclosed. In particular, reference numbers 82, 84, and 87 were not referred to in the specification and are deleted.

Applicants sent a preliminary amendment dated July 21, 2004. To avoid confusion about entry of amendments, etc., applicants withdraw the amendment of July 21, 2004. The now-enclosed status of claims shows the same amendments and a few others. The claims have been renumbered, to correct the error examiner noted.

The specification has been amended for clarity in several places. The claims have been amended and argument hereinafter is addressed to them as such. With reference to office action paragraph 2, applicants have responded by inserting parentheses at various places.

Claim 3-5 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103, based on the Maestro patent. Applicants argue for reconsideration and withdrawal as follows.

Claim 3 requires that both sidewall thickness and perforation height vary with elevation. Maestro does not disclose or teach that perforation height should vary at all, although he discussed perforation (aperture) dimensions. See Col. 5, lines 33-56. Maestro therefore certainly therefore does not suggest that both opening dimension and thickness should vary, or in what way (i.e., as a function of elevation).